

REMARKS

The Office Action dated September 2, 2005, has been received and carefully noted. The amendments made herein and the following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 1, 4, and 10 have been amended, and claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled without prejudice. The Applicant submits that the new claims as well as the amendments made herein are fully supported in the specification and the drawings as originally filed, and therefore no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-5, 7-14 are pending in the present application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 2 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cleveland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,567,289, hereinafter "Cleveland"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 1 as amended, recites a semiconductor memory device comprising a plurality of areas, each accommodating one or more small sectors in a predetermined physical address of each area, or in a series of a plurality of physical addresses including the predetermined physical address of the area, said predetermined physical address being one of a highest physical address of the area and a lowest physical address of the area, a plurality of sectors larger than one or more of the small sectors in each of the plurality of the areas, and an address-conversion circuit configured to perform conversion of a sector address inputted from an outside source to make the

plurality of the areas function as the same boot block type, wherein the address-conversion circuit controls conversion of the sector address based on a signal specifying a boot block type, inputted from the outside source.

Claim 10 as amended, recites a method for converting an address comprising connecting a conversion circuit to a semiconductor memory device having a plurality of areas, each having a plurality of sectors larger than one or more of small sectors in each of the plurality of the areas, and converting a sector-address inputted from an outside source based on a signal specifying a boot block type by the sector-address conversion circuit, so that the semiconductor memory device functions as a same boot block type, wherein the sector address inputted may address any one of the plurality of sectors in the memory device.

It is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to disclose or suggest at least the above-mentioned features of the Applicants' invention.

In making the rejection, the Office Action rejected claims 1, 2 and 10 as being anticipated by Cleveland. The Applicant submits that claim 3 was NOT rejected as being anticipated by Cleveland, and therefore the subject matter recited in claim 3 is allowable over Cleveland.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 10 have been amended to incorporate the allowable subject matter recited in claim 3, and intervening claim 2, respectively. Thus, the Applicant submits that claims 1 and 10 are allowable.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 10-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Furuyama et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,643,758, hereinafter “Furuyama”).

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits the attached English translation of priority document (Japanese Patent Application No. 2001-016302), along with a statement that the English translation is accurate. As such, it is submitted that the Applicant has perfected the claim of foreign priority to the effective priority date of January 18, 2001, which predates the filing date of Furuyama. Hence, the Applicant submits that Furuyama is NOT a valid reference under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Conclusion

In view of the above, the Applicant respectfully submits that each of claims 1, 4-5, 7-14 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art. Applicants also submit that the subject matter is more than sufficient to render the claims non-obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, and therefore respectfully request that claims 1, 4-5, 7-14 be found allowable and that this application be passed to issue.

If for any reason, the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper has not been timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing docket number 100353-00092.

Respectfully submitted,



Sam Huang
Registration No. 48,430

Customer No. 004372
AREN'T FOX, PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 857-6395

SH:lbm

Enclosures: English Translation of Japanese Patent Application No. 2001-016302
Petition for Extension of Time (3 months)